

REMARKS

Applicant has amended the independent claims, without adding new matter, to clarify the claimed invention. Particularly, the word “event” as used the claims had different meanings. One usage of event referred to items on a list, while another usage referred to the actual events that occurred. Although the particular meaning of the word “event” was clear from the context of the claims, Applicant has amended the claim language to make the distinction explicit. The claims now use the terms “event item” to refer to a list item that corresponds to one or more consolidated occurrences of an actual event, and “consolidated event list” to refer to the list that has the “event items.” *See e.g., Spec.*, pp. 12-14. These amendments do not change the scope of the claims.

Regarding the rejections, The Examiner rejected claim 1 as being obvious over Kraft in view of Hosack. Amended claim 1 is directed to a method of accessing functions in a mobile communication device. The method generates and dynamically updates a consolidated event list to consolidate one or more events of different event types (e.g., missed calls, missed SMS messages, etc.). To update the list, the method dynamically adds and deletes event items to and from the list. An event item corresponds to a consolidated set of one or more events of the same event type. For example, the consolidated list may include a first event item corresponding to one or more missed voice calls, and a second event item corresponding to one or more missed SMS messages. Event items are added to the consolidated event list whenever a new event occurs and the consolidated event list does not already include an event item corresponding to the same event type. Event items are deleted from the consolidated list **only if** a user has responded to all the events corresponding to the event item. *E.g., Spec.*, p. 13, ln. 22 – p. 14, ll. 13.

Neither cited reference teaches or suggests, alone or in combination, generating a consolidated event list as claimed. The consolidated event list consolidates events according to

event type. Particularly, it includes one or more event items, each of which corresponds to a different type of event and one or more occurrences of that type of event.

Kraft discloses a “Redo/Undo” list. This list is not a consolidated event list as claimed, but rather, is an activity list. The items on the Kraft list identify “all kinds of activities,” regardless of type, and are placed on the list according to a first-in-first-out scheme. *Kraft*, col. 1, ln. 66 – col. 2, ln. 21. Hosack does not remedy Kraft and simply discloses a list that identifies received text messages stored in a database. Hosack does not consolidate events according to their different types, and in fact, does not need to since Hosack is concerned with only a single type of event.

Therefore, both Kraft and Hosack fail to teach or suggest generating a consolidated event list as claimed. Because both fail to teach or suggest this element alone, they necessarily cannot be combined to teach or suggest this element of claim 1.

Additionally, because the references fail to teach or suggest the claimed consolidated event list, they cannot dynamically update the consolidated event list as claimed. The Examiner admits that Kraft does not dynamically delete event items from the list as claimed, but asserts that Hosack does. This is incorrect because Hosack simply prioritizes stored messages for deletion based on a three-point prioritization scheme. *Hosack*, col. 5, ll. 33-37.

The scheme for deleting messages from the list in Hosack is nothing like the claimed criterion for deleting event items from the consolidated event list. Particularly, even unread messages are deleted from the list Hosack.

[T]he oldest read, unanchored message would, if necessary, be deleted first from the message database 252. Thereafter, when all read, unanchored messages have been deleted, the unread, unanchored messages would be deleted in an order determined by reception time. Finally, the read, anchored message from the stock service would be deleted if necessary. Although not shown in this example, an unread, anchored message from another anchored source would not be deleted until after deletion of the read, anchored message from the stock service.

Hosack, col. 6, ll. 5-16 (emphasis added). However, deleting event items from the consolidated list if a user has not yet responded to all the corresponding events is inapposite to claim 1.

The references fail to teach or suggest claim 1, alone or in combination. Neither generates the claimed consolidated event list. Further, in both references, unread messages can be (and are) deleted from a list to free memory. Because neither reference alone teaches or suggests every element of claim 1, they cannot be combined to teach or suggest claim 1. Therefore, the §103 rejection to claim 1 and to its dependent claims fails.

The Examiner also rejected independent claims 10, 19, and 28 as being obvious by Kraft in view of *Hosack* for substantially the same reasons as those cited for claim 1. However, claims 10, 19, and 28 include language similar to that of claim 1. Accordingly, for reasons similar to those stated above, claims 10, 19, and 28, and each of their dependent claims are patentably non-obvious.

Finally, Applicant has added claim 35, without adding new matter, for consideration by the Examiner. Particularly, the user may identify certain types of events to be excluded from the consolidated event list. Event items can only be added for those types of events that have not been excluded. *Spec.*, p. 13, ll. 3-11. None of the cited references teaches or suggests this aspect, and thus, claim 35 is also patentably non-obvious over the art.

In light of the foregoing remarks, Applicant requests that the Examiner allow all pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

COATS & BENNETT, P.L.L.C.


Stephen A. Herrera

Registration No.: 47,642

Dated: April 30, 2008

1400 Crescent Green, Suite 300
Cary, NC 27518
Telephone: (919) 854-1844
Facsimile: (919) 854-2084